

**REMARKS**

Claims 1 through 53 are pending in this application. Claims 6 through 53 are hereby canceled without prejudice or disclaimer, and claims 54 through 60 are hereby added. In addition, claim 1 is hereby amended.

Claims 1 through 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. In particular, the language "the predetermined screen area" of claim 1, line 6, lacks clear antecedent basis. Accordingly, reference to the handwriting recognition circuitry in claim 1 is hereby relocated to a subsequent part of the claim so that it follows the initial reference to the "predetermined area". Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, are respectfully requested.

Claims 1 and 3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,367,453 to Capps, et al. ("Capps, et al. patent"). Also, claims 2 and 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the Capps, et al. patent in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,682,439 to Beernink, et al. ("Beernink, et al. patent"), and claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the Capps, et al. patent in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,754,686 to Harada, et al. ("Harada, et al. patent"). In rejecting the claims, the above Office Action also references U.S. Patent No. 4,972,496 to Sklarew ("Sklarew patent").

The following explanation is proffered to enhance the Examiner's understanding of the differences between present invention and the cited prior art. As described by the Background Description of the specification, write-anywhere user interfaces were generally known in the art

at the time the instant application was filed. In particular, a write-anywhere user interface of a device may receive handwritten input at any and all parts of the device's touch-enabled screen. In response to receiving the handwritten input, the write-anywhere user interface provides a pop-up window on the screen at a location near the reception area of the handwritten input. The pop-up window is utilized for error correction of the received handwritten input. However, as described at page 2, line 18, through page 3, line 22, of the specification, write-anywhere user interfaces do not easily distinguish between handwriting input from user interface manipulation or from interference by a user's finger when it inadvertently touches the screen.

The present invention provides a handwriting input user interface that easily distinguishes between a control mode and an inking mode of a pen and enables accurate recognition of handwritten words. The present invention accomplishes this improvement by restricting handwriting input to a window at a particular location, such as the lower portion, of the touch-enabled screen. Even though the touch-enabled screen may receive and display information anywhere, a circuit of the apparatus restricts the placement of the window to a particular location in order to easily distinguish handwriting input from user interface manipulation and to minimize any interference by inadvertent contact of user's finger.

Claim 1 as amended provides, *inter alia*, a predetermined area of the screen less than the predetermined size of the screen on which handwriting is recognized in which the predetermined area being solely provided at a particular location of the screen and configured to display handwritten input. Thus, amended claim 1 provides a handwriting input area that displays handwritten input and, yet, is restricted to only a particular position of the screen.

In contrast, the Capps, et al. patent, the Beernink, et al. patent, the Harada, et al. patent, and the Sklarew patent, independently or in combination, do not describe or suggest a handwriting input area that displays handwritten input and is restricted to a particular position of the screen, as required by amended claim 1. The Capps, et al. patent and the Beernink, et al. patent describe write-anywhere devices in which the handwriting input areas are not restricted to a single position of the screen. Likewise, the Harada, et al. patent and the Sklarew patent describe similar devices in which a handwriting input area may be designated (see FIG. 19) but it is not restricted to a particular position of the screen. Accordingly, amended claim 1 distinguishes patentably from the Capps, et al. patent, the Beernink, et al. patent, the Harada, et al. patent, the Sklarew patent, and any combination of these patents.

Claims 2 through 5 depend from and include all limitations of independent claim 1 as amended. Therefore, claims 2 through 5 distinguish patentably from the Capps, et al. patent, the Beernink, et al. patent, the Harada, et al. patent, the Sklarew patent, and any combination of these patents for the reasons stated above for amended claim 1.

In view of the above, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of claims 1 through 5 are respectfully requested.

New claims 54 through 60 are presented to more completely cover Applicants' apparatus. In particular, new claim 54 provides, *inter alia*, a touch-enabled screen configured to receive and display information; and a circuit configured to provide a window for receiving and displaying handwritten data, to recognize single and multiple character words based on the handwritten data received and displayed in the window, and to restrict the window to a particular location of the

touch-enabled screen. Support for new claims 54 through 60 is provided by the specification, primarily at page 5 and 6. Allowance of new claims 54 through 60 is believed warranted.

### CONCLUSION

No amendment made was related to the statutory requirements of patentability unless expressly stated herein. Also, no amendment made was for the purpose of narrowing the scope of any claim, unless Applicants have argued herein that such amendment was made to distinguish over a particular reference or combination of references.

Please charge any fees associated with, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 50-2117.

It is submitted that the claims clearly define the invention, are supported by the specification and drawings, and are in a condition for allowance. A Notice of Allowance is respectfully solicited. Should the Examiner have any questions or concerns that may expedite prosecution of the present application, the Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned.

Please forward all correspondence to:  
Motorola, Inc.  
Law Department (HDW)  
600 North US Highway 45, AN475  
Libertyville, IL 60048

Respectfully submitted,  
Seni, Giovanni, et al.

 06/25/03

Hisashi D. Watanabe Date  
Attorney for Applicant(s)  
Registration No. 37,465  
Telephone: (847) 523-2322  
Facsimile: (847) 523-2350